

MINUTES OF DESIGN EXCELLENCE PANEL MEETING Thursday 9th July 2020

DEP PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rory Toomey	Chairperson	Government Architect NSW
Alf Lester	Panel Member	LFA Pacific Pty Ltd
Matthew Taylor	Panel Member	Taylor Brammer Landscape Architects Pty Ltd

OBSERVERS:

Scott Sidhom	Coordinator Urban Design	Liverpool City Council
Danielle Hijazi	Panel Support Officer	Liverpool City Council
Adam Flynn	Senior Planner	Liverpool City Council

ITEM DETAILS:

Item Number: 2.

Application Reference Number: DA-220/2020.

Property Address: 18 Randwick Close, Casula NSW.

Meeting Venue: Via Microsoft Teams.

Time: 11:30am - 12:15pm.

Proposal: Construction of a Seniors Housing Development involving a 142-room residential care facility & 93 Independent living units in 3 buildings over Basement parking and retail shops.

1.0 WELCOME, ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND OPENING

The Chairperson introduced the Panel and Council staff to the Applicant Representatives.

Attendees signed the Attendance Registration Sheet.

The Liverpool Design Excellence Panel's (the Panel), comments are to assist Liverpool City Council in its consideration of the Development Application.

The absence of a comment under any of the principles does not necessarily imply that the Panel considers the particular matter has been satisfactorily addressed, as it may be that changes suggested under other principles will generate a desirable change.

All nine design principles must be considered and discussed. Recommendations are to be made for each of the nine principles, unless they do not apply to the project. If repetition of recommendations occur, these may be grouped together but must be acknowledged.

2.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

NIL.

3.0 PRESENTATION

The applicant presented their proposal for DA-220/2020, 18 Randwick Close, Casula NSW.

4.0 DEP PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

The nine design principles were considered by the panel in discussion of the Development Application. These are 1] **Context**, 2] **Built Form + Scale**, 3] **Density**, 4] **Sustainability**, 5] **Landscape**, 6] **Amenity**, 7] **Safety**, 8] **Housing Diversity + Social Interaction**, 9] **Aesthetics**.

The Design Excellence Panel makes the following recommendations in relation to the project:

4.1. Context

- The development needs to be sympathetic to providing an inclusive environment, however it needs to be more public and feel more open. Revise the proposal so that it is more inviting and connects better to the adjacent park and to other areas around the site including considering broader neighbourhood connections and movement patterns (e.g. to Casula Mall).
- The current proposed entry from Randwick Close is not welcoming; it does not read as a publicly accessible entrance to the site or consider the broader connections to the site (e.g. Connections to Casula Mall). Reinforce or clarify the sense of arrival and connection to the site and through the site, for the community that will be approaching from the south. Hard and soft landscape strategies may be employed to achieve this (e.g. lighting, legibility and signage).
- The panel acknowledges that building bulk to the south has responded to earlier DEP comments.
- Consider the relationship between the height of this development (i.e. Block A), and the development located on the other side of Kurrajong Road.

4.2. Built Form + Scale

- The proposal has improved from a built form perspective since the last DEP meeting, however, a building height of 22.050m (i.e. a 6m non-compliance with Council's DCP controls) is not supported. Adhering to a maximum building height of 18m is recommended by the panel, in line with Council objectives. Review the massing of the development to achieve compliance.
- The panel notes that overall, this is quite an intense and built-up development given the intention to achieve internal open spaces within the site. Given the proposition to develop higher and more dense building forms, focus should be directed toward how individual blocks relate to each other, to the intermediate open spaces and to the surrounding residential areas, the laneway and recreation area.

- Demonstrate how consolidation of built form and opening of ground plane as a design strategy, is helping to benefit the community and the relationship with neighbouring properties and open space.
- A clear response has been made to previous panel recommendations, including the stepping of building heights across the development. However, the treatment of edges of those buildings and how they relate to the buildings to the south, and to each other is important. Re-work the section drawings to illustrate the relationship between interior spaces, adjacent outdoor spaces and to neighbouring properties.

4.3. Density

- The proposal is compliant with Council's FSR controls of 1.5:1 for the site. However, this density results in a lot of GFA on site. Ensure that the distribution of GFA on the site achieves quality amenity outcomes for neighbours and the community.
- There appears to be communal space (constituting GFA) on level 5 of one of the buildings. This is located above the 18m recommended height limit and needs to be relocated to be below the 18m limit.
- Provide Council with confirmation of density calculations. Page 21 of the submitted presentation document notes an FSR of 1.62:1 and needs to be clarified.

4.4. Sustainability

- The panel notes that the sustainability aspects of the proposal are developing and becoming a core part of the proposal – this is commended, however, details have not been provided to the panel. The comments made in the previous DEP meeting still apply and need to be considered as the proposal is further developed. (Refer to previous Minutes of Meeting).

4.5. Landscape

- The panel commends the applicant for the approach to the open space design on the building rooftops.
- There is still a lack of clarity in terms of which areas of ground-level open space are public, semi-public or private. The use and nature of these open space typologies needs to be clearly communicated on the plans.
- The relationship of desire lines and pathways created through the site (I.e. in terms of who can use which pathways and at what times of the day/night) needs to be clearly communicated on the plans.
- The relationship between the margins of the site and adjacent development in a landscape sense is important. Select appropriate plant species to moderate interfaces between public and adjacent private open spaces.
- Clarify relationship between Landscape Design and the proposed Deep Soil Zones on the plans.
- A successful and realistic landscape design is critical to overall success of this proposal. Species need to be chosen for their long-term performance in their specific locations on this site.
- Despite the reference to an open lobby located between the two wings of building C, the lobby does not address Randwick Close, and is effectively a wall rather than a gateway

into the site. Revise the proposal to achieve a more direct physical and visual link between the adjacent open space and frontage to Randwick Close. (Refer to recommendations made in previous DEP meeting).

4.6. Amenity

- The panel recommends more intense consideration of the amenity of the neighbourhood and broader community. As noted in the previous DEP meeting, provide a proposal to upgrade and embellish the walkway located between Randwick Close and the adjacent park, so that it is improved for community benefit.

4.7. Safety

- Given that this is an Aged Care Facility with neighbourhood access through the site, provide greater clarity on public access into and within the site. Demonstrate a more balanced approach to permeability and legibility to the site, considerate of neighbours and residents.

4.8. Housing Diversity + Social Interaction

- NIL. The panel supports the mixed type of housing and notes that the allocation of aged care facilities and other uses on the site is clear.

4.9. Aesthetics

- The panel notes and supports the careful approach that has been taken, regarding the finishing to the exterior of the building. Overall, the aesthetics of the proposal have been well handled and well modelled.
- The articulation of buildings B and C has been well resolved and is supported.
- The southern side of the development interfaces with the adjacent low-density neighbourhood. Ensure that the materials selected and building details are sympathetic to the context.

5.0 OUTCOME

The panel have determined the outcome of the DEP review and have provided final direction to the applicant as follows:

The project is not supported in its current form and needs to return to the panel once the recommendations and comments above have been addressed.